

REMARKS

The above amendments and following remarks are responsive to the points raised in the December 31, 2003 final Office Action. Upon entry of the above amendments, Claims 1, 3-5, 7, and 9-12 will have been amended and new Claim 13 will have been added. Claims 1-13 will be pending. No new matter has been introduced. No issues have been added Entry and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Response to Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Fukasaka et al. ((Fukasaka) EP 0 860 978 A2). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Independent Claims 1, 9, and 10 have been amended to better define the recited invention, correct informalities, and improve their readability. More specifically, Claim 1 has been amended to recite an image sensing apparatus including, inter alia, signal generation means for generating a trigger signal to perform an image-sensing operation,

“wherein said image sensing apparatus determines, in accordance with a trigger signal, if said information processing apparatus is in a suspended status and, if so, said image sensing apparatus transmits a resume signal to said information processing apparatus.”

Independent Claims 9 and 10, respectively, have been amended to recite a control method and a storage medium storing control program codes to reflect the amendments made to Claim 1.

Independent Claim 11 has been amended to better define the recited invention, correct informalities, and improve their readability. More specifically, Claim 11 has been



amended to recite an image sensing method for an image sensing apparatus including the steps of:

“determining if the information processing apparatus is in a suspended status, and

transmitting, in accordance with information determined in the determining step, a resume signal to the information processing apparatus.”

New Claim 13 recites a storage medium storing program codes for carrying out an image sensing method in an image sensing apparatus that reflects the image sensing method recited in Claim 11.

Independent Claim 12 has been amended to better define the recited invention, correct informalities, and improve its readability. More specifically, Claim 12 has been amended to recite a control apparatus for controlling an image sensing apparatus including, inter alia, signal generation means for generating a trigger signal to perform an image-sensing related operation:

“wherein said image sensing apparatus determines, in accordance with a trigger signal, if said information processing apparatus is in a suspended status and, if so, said control apparatus controls said image sensing apparatus to transmit a resume signal to said information processing apparatus”

Fukasaka discloses a camera that, inter alia, transmits image signals to a computer as moving image signals or still image signals in accordance with the operation of a shutter button of the camera. Fukasaka discloses that when the shutter button is pressed, the camera control detects such operation and transmits an application execution request signal to the computer for instructing the computer to execute a predetermined

application program consistent with the type of image signal, i.e., moving or still, to be transmitted from the camera to the computer.

In distinct contrast to the invention recited in the claims of the present application, no where does Fukasaka teach or suggest a camera that determines if the computer is in a suspended status and, if so, transmits a resume signal thereto when the computer is determined to be in a suspended status. In Fukasaka, an application execution request signal is generated and transmitted to the computer each time the shutter button is pressed irrespective of whether or not the computer is already running the desired application program. Applicant's claimed invention, however, determines if the information processing apparatus is in a suspended status and, if so, transmits a resume signal to the information processing apparatus. As such, the invention recited in independent Claims 1 and 9-13 are distinguished over the prior art reference of Fukasaka. Dependent Claims 2-8 are likewise distinguished over Fukasaka for at least the same reason as discussed for independent Claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-13 are in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.



AUTHORIZATIONS:

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for the timely consideration of this amendment, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 1232-4623.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Date: March 29, 2004

By: 

Brian W. Brown

Reg. No.: 47,265

(202) 857-7887 Telephone

(202) 857-7929 Facsimile

Correspondence Address:

Morgan & Finnegan
345 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10154
(212) 758-4800 Telephone
(212) 751-6849 Facsimile

